

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SEVEN

In re D.S., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

B235632
(Riverside County Super. Ct.
No. RIJ1100593
Los Angeles County Super. Ct.
No. GJ28682)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

D.S.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from orders of the Riverside County and Los Angeles County Superior Courts. Charles J. Koosed, Judge and Philip L. Soto, Judge. Affirmed.

Bruce G. Finebaum, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

On the afternoon of April 26, 2011, the minor D.S., and his companions, H.M. and an adult male,¹ approached Jacob V. and Preston Dupree Banks, who were sitting on a hiking trail in Riverside County. The minor and his two companions, physically restrained Jacob and Banks and repeatedly struck each of them in the face, before taking Banks's wallet and cell phone and Jacob's Sony Playstation Portable. D.S. was later arrested by Riverside County Sheriff's Deputies.

On May 9, 2011, the district attorney of Riverside County filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition against D.S., alleging he committed two counts of second degree robbery (Pen. Code, § 211). D.S. denied the allegations on May 12, 2011.

On May 19, 2011, D.S. filed a motion to dismiss for prosecutorial misconduct, which the juvenile court heard and denied on June 2, 2011.

On June 22, 2011, D.S. filed a motion for discovery under Evidence Code sections 1043 and 1045 and *Pitchess v. Superior Court* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 531 (*Pitchess*). The trial court conducted an in camera hearing after it determined D.S. had demonstrated good cause to discover information in the personnel and administrative records of one of the sheriff's deputies pertaining to dishonesty, bias or racism. The trial court found none of the incidents reviewed was relevant to D.S.'s case and, therefore, disclosure of material from the deputy's personnel files was not appropriate. (See *People v. Mooc* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 1216, 1219.)

Following a jurisdiction hearing on July 21, 2011, the Riverside County Superior Court (Judge Charles J. Koosed) found the allegations true, sustained the petition and declared the offenses felonies and D.S. a ward of the court and ordered the action transferred to Los Angeles County for disposition.

At the disposition hearing on August 9, 2011, the Los Angeles County Superior Court (Judge Philip L. Soto) ordered D.S. into a six-month camp community placement program and calculated the maximum period of confinement as six years.

¹ Neither of the minor's companions is a party to this appeal.

D.S. timely filed a notice of appeal. We appointed counsel to represent him on appeal. After examination of the record counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On March 12, 2012, we advised D.S. that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied D.S.'s attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.) Pursuant to counsel's request under *People v. Mooc, supra*, 26 Cal.4th at p. 1219, we have reviewed the sealed record of the in camera hearing conducted by the Riverside County Superior Court after it granted D.S.'s *Pitchess* motion. We conclude the record adequately describes the documents the court reviewed, and the court satisfied the minimum requirements in determining whether there was discoverable information. No abuse of discretion occurred. (*Id.* at p. 1229.)

The order is affirmed.

ZELON, J.

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

JACKSON, J.